

device. Instead, device manufacturers will have the flexibility to display FCC certification information through software on device screens.

There are numerous potential benefits to e-labeling. For example, e-labels can provide more information to consumers than is conveyed today, such as details regarding the device warranties, recycling, and trade-in opportunities. E-labeling will also lower production costs for device manufacturers since affixing labels to a device can require significant design time and expensive equipment.

I would also note that we should commend FCC Chairman Wheeler and his staff in the Office of Engineering and Technology for recently taking steps to update the Commission's e-labeling policies.

By working together with the FCC, we can provide innovators with more flexibility and speed the delivery of new devices in the marketplace.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LATTA, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5161.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ISLAMIC JIHAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am so profoundly grateful to be able to stand in the well of the United States House of Representatives. There is no greater bastion for free speech than here in this House. What a wonderful gift this is, not only just for people here in the United States, but also for people around the world.

There is one thing that we have learned from Tiananmen Square, and I had the privilege in August of being able to travel to China and visit and stand in the midst of Tiananmen Square, where people from around China had come to take a stand for speech. If we remember from that infa-

mous photo that was taken, one very brave student held up a copy of a little pamphlet in front of a tank when a tank was going to run this student over. The document that the student held up was a copy of the United States Declaration of Independence, as he spoke about freedom and what freedom meant to him.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we have always been in this country—this is a standard-bearer for liberty, a standard-bearer for freedom and a standard-bearer for the expression of free speech rights. That is why we take this opportunity so seriously to be able to keep safe this ability, to be able to speak out on the issues of the day.

If there is anything that has captured America's attention with horror, I believe, especially over these summer months as the United States Congress had taken a recess—the Members of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate had gone back into their districts, and they had met with people on the ground who allowed them to come and serve here in this Congress—it is, when they went home, they also saw on their televisions at night a fairly horrific sight, something that we thank God with everything within our beings that we don't see frequently here in the United States. It was terrorism—and terrorism on a level that we were unfamiliar with and hadn't seen before.

We heard of a group named ISIS, and we saw they had continued to make wild gains both in Iraq and in Syria, so much so that they were robbing banks to fill their own pockets. Then they began to steal oilfields and take those oilfields over. Then they took over oil refineries. Then they began to take over electric grids. Then, with just seemingly very few men, they took over entire cities. In fact, we were shocked when the city of Mosul, which is the ancient city of Nineveh—the prophet Jonah was sent to the city of Nineveh, where he preached to the city, and the Holy Bible records that the entire city repented and turned to God. That ancient city is the modern day city of Mosul in northern Iraq. That was the city that the leader of the Islamic State—the jihadists that we have seen every night on our national news programs—chose to come against. That particular city had a population of well over a million people, and some estimate there were 1.7 million people.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would be more than delighted to yield to the wonderful gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX.

#### RECOGNIZING CHILDRESS INSTITUTE FOR PEDIATRIC TRAUMA

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding. I know she has an important message to bring tonight, and I appreciate her sharing a little of her time with me.

Mr. Speaker, at a recent event, I had the privilege of learning more about a remarkable organization in Winston-

Salem, North Carolina—the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma at Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center. The institute was established due to the leadership and generous financial support of Richard and Judy Childress, who saw that, while trauma was taking the lives of thousands of children every year, pediatric trauma was not a focus of medical research.

In 2010, according to the Centers for Disease Control, pediatric trauma took the lives of 9,523 children, making it the largest cause of childhood death by a significant margin. As a comparison, cancer, heart disease, and birth defects combined take the lives of about 3,300 children every year. Tragically, 3,300 is a very similar number of children who were killed in 2010 due to traumatic injury from child abuse. An additional 6,190 children died that year from unintentional traumatic injuries. A full 52 percent of those injuries were caused by vehicle accidents, followed by drowning, poisoning, fire, guns, and falls. In addition to the nearly 10,000 fatalities, another 175,000 children were hospitalized due to injuries.

Dr. C. Everett Koop, who served as U.S. Surgeon General under President Reagan, once said: "If a disease were killing our children in the proportions that injuries are, people would be outraged and demand that this killer be stopped."

Despite trauma being the overwhelming cause of childhood death, the Federal Government spends only about 1 cent on pediatric trauma research for every dollar spent to study pediatric cancer.

The Childress Institute has been working to pick up where Federal dollars have dropped off. The institute uses its resources for research, education, and awareness about pediatric trauma and to improve the treatment for critically injured children in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Childress is a lifelong resident of the Winston-Salem area, and is a NASCAR pioneer. Richard and his wife, Judy, are civic and philanthropic leaders in the community. Through their determination to fight the number one cause of pediatric death, children worldwide are benefiting from the generosity that those of us in North Carolina have long witnessed.

□ 1845

The remarkable people of the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma work tirelessly to discover and share the best ways to prevent injuries and treat severely injured children, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that all "injured kids get the best care when they need it the most."

Today, I thank Richard and Judy Childress for their foresight and generosity, and I thank the Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center in Winston-Salem for its expertise and dedication to this mission.

Finally, I want to recognize the dedicated men and women of the Childress

Institute for Pediatric Trauma for working every day to keep our children safe and to help them recover when they get hurt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for so graciously yielding to me this evening.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to give words of praise for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX. She is a stalwart on almost every topic and every subject that there is in this Chamber.

She is one of the few women that you will regularly see here almost on a daily basis, taking the debate to the American people, so that they can understand that our society can be in conformity with what the creators of this society wanted, a place that was, first of all, peaceful, a place that would be welcoming, and a nation that would allow everyone who comes here to realize their dreams in a way that would even stretch their own imaginations. She has been a stalwart, and that is Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX, and I am grateful that she was able to come and speak here this evening.

I would like to be able to continue, Mr. Speaker, with this important topic because, again, these are extraordinary times and extraordinary days that we live in. As we all know from the news reports, the President of the United States, tomorrow night, will be addressing the Nation on the topic of Islamic jihad, particularly the Islamic State, as they call themselves today.

Some people may know them as ISIS or ISIL. They call themselves the Islamic State. The President will be talking about this threat, and I think that the country is anxious to hear what the President of the United States will say.

I serve on the Intelligence Committee. It is a privilege to serve on the Intelligence Committee. It is a fairly small committee. We deal with the classified secrets of our Nation. We also deal primarily with terrorism and how to keep the Nation safe, and as a member of that committee, we have watched this group called the Islamic State form.

We have watched it for well over 2 years because what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is nothing new. It is a continuation of the concept known as Islamic jihad.

While maybe this is a new name and this is a new format, the Islamic State, it is merely a continuation of a phenomenon that began in 700 A.D. under the prophet Muhammad who took the sword and violently attempted to convert people to his religion to various villages, whether it was Mecca or Medina, he used the sword to violently force individuals to convert to Islam.

That attempted conversion has continued from 700 A.D. forward, and so what we are seeing today is the Islamic jihad, the continuation, and it is also at its root a religious war.

While sitting on the Intelligence Committee, watching the rise of the Is-

lamic jihad, we learned and studied about who this leader of the Islamic jihad is. His name is Baghdadi. He is about 43 years old. He is very well-educated. He has a doctorate degree.

He has been involved in al Qaeda as a senior member for decades. So, again, this is not a new individual. This is not a brandnew thought or a brandnew concept. This is an individual who has dedicated his life to jihad. His name, again, is Baghdadi.

As we watched Baghdadi and his rise, something stunned me, and I hope that everyone in the United States understands this one concept: we, in the United States, had intercepted Baghdadi, the current head of the Islamic State. We had Baghdadi in United States custody. We had him in custody in Iraq, the country where he was born, and he was in a United States detention center.

The reason why he was in detention is because he was a terrorist committing terrorist acts, and he was committed to pursuing terrorist goals. We had him in detention, and President Obama chose in 2009 to release Baghdadi from detention in Iraq. He was set free.

Now, was Baghdadi rehabilitated? Had we confirmed that he had renounced Islamic jihad, that he had renounced acts of terror, that he was no longer going to pick up the sword and force people at the threat of their life or beheadings to convert to Islam?

That wasn't it at all. As a matter of fact, at the moment when the United States released Baghdadi from the United States prison, Camp Bucca in Iraq, at that moment, Baghdadi said to his jailer, "I will see you in New York."

That should have been a tipoff right there and then that we should have nabbed him and held him and retained him in detention. This was not a good candidate for release.

Today, Baghdadi is the head of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and the self-appointed caliph of the new caliphate. He reconstituted al Qaeda in Iraq. As a matter of fact, the very first franchise or affiliate of al Qaeda was located in Iraq. Baghdadi himself was the number three in the organization.

We in the United States took out and killed the number one and the number two in al Qaeda of Iraq. Baghdadi was number three. He was ready to move up, obviously, to be the number one of al Qaeda in Iraq, but he didn't have the opportunity.

He didn't have the opportunity when he was in detention in 2009. He had to look for his opportunity and reconstitute himself and his organization and build an organization, which he did. He began in 2009, and he began with what he called "break the walls"—that was his name, a "break the walls" strategy.

It was a campaign whereby he opened prison doors all across northern Iraq, and he released terrorists from prisons, so these are prisoners that we captured—the United States—or that the

Iraqi forces working with the United States had captured.

So terrorists who are behind bars in jail in Iraq in pursuit of the Islamic jihad were behind bars, and the one man that President Obama released from jail in Iraq went to the other prisons and opened the prison doors and began forming his army, and his army was formed with convicted Islamic jihadist terrorists.

He broke open so many jails, and he again then recruited other terrorists from the region that today Baghdadi has an army—a brutal, savage, animalistic army of 12,000 individuals who are so brutal.

We heard the reports that they literally buried alive innocent women and children in northern Iraq. They chased families up a mountain, Mount Sinjar, the Yazidis. The Yazidis were a peace-loving people, but they were considered devil worshippers by Baghdadi and his band of the Islamic State. They couldn't have that, so they chased these people.

One and two and then 10 and then 100 and then thousands of Yazidis were killed by these barbarians and the Islamic State. They died of thirst. They died of hunger. They died of beheadings.

Men were separated from women. Women were raped. Women were carried away and kidnapped. They were forced into sexual slavery to serve the animals who had beheaded their husbands and their sons. Literally, hundreds of men were taken away and beheaded by the Islamic State, led by Baghdadi, the man who had been released from prison by President Obama.

I wonder if President Obama will have something to say about his decision to release Baghdadi when he addresses the Nation tomorrow night. Clearly, this was a mistake that never should have happened.

Well, once Baghdadi had his terrorists released from prison, they began a wave of car bombings across Iraq. As Baghdadi reconstituted his Army in 2010 and 2011, he began his strategy. His outward strategy was a series of nationwide car bombings in 2011 and 2013 all across Iraq.

He destabilized Iraq and destabilized the Government of Iraq and destabilized the Army of Iraq to the point where they were more and more fearful of the Islamic State and what they were intending to do.

So bold did Baghdadi become that his aim was not simply on Iraq and on Syria or just on Gaza or just on Israel or on Jordan or on Turkey or on Lebanon. He gave a speech in January of this year, 2014.

In this speech, Baghdadi spoke to America. This is what he had to say to America—the leader of ISIS—"Soon we'll be in direct confrontation, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching."

I repeat, "Soon we'll be in direct confrontation, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching."

They posted a picture of the al Qaeda flag—the black flag—flying over the White House. They have intentions, all right. Their intentions are not just in the Middle East. Their intentions are terrorist activity also in Western Europe and also in the United States of America.

Why? They tell us what their goal is. Their goal is to force the peoples of Western Europe and to force the peoples of the United States of America to convert to Islam at the tip of a sword, whatever it takes.

You see, we are in the shadow of the 13th anniversary of the horrific tragedy of 9/11, when we saw what 19 committed Islamic jihadists can achieve with an airline ticket in one hand and a box cutter in another.

They drove the planes on that morning of September 11 directly into tower number one and tower number two in New York City. They felled the towers, and 3,000 innocents died.

They also took off in a jet here in this city, from the airport in this city. That airplane went directly into the Pentagon, and more hundreds of innocents died, and that wasn't alone. Another jet took off.

No one knows if that jet was intended to come into this building, if they were targeting this very well, 13 years ago. Were they targeting this well, this rotunda, the Capitol? Were they targeting the White House?

We will never know. We will never know because the brave Americans on Flight 93 infamously said, "Let's roll." They were the first resistance that day, the first American resistance to push back and say, "Not in my Nation, you don't."

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to those Americans who said, who realized through phone calls with their loved ones, when they tragically picked up the phone and found out the horrifying news of what had happened in New York City to the World Trade towers, of what had happened to the Pentagon, and they knew very likely that the plane that they were on could be carrying them also on a nefarious mission, and to the point of losing their own lives, they stood up and said, "This is our last chance, but we're not going to sit here, we're going to fight back," and they did. They fought back. They lost their lives that day.

□ 1900

They lost their lives that day, but they saved that jet from being used as a missile on another target.

You see, Americans and America didn't wait. We didn't wait to be defeated by this evil philosophy and this evil enemy. Brave Americans stood up that day and said, "No more." And the question we have is: Do we hear their voices? Do we still hear their voices? Is there bravery yet among us today to heed their call? Because, you see, the Islamic jihadists haven't changed. They haven't deviated in their intent. They haven't deviated in their ulti-

mate goal, which is to spread their caliphate across the entire world, not just in Iraq, not just in Syria, but across the entire world, including the United States of America.

We saw what they did in Benghazi 2 years ago, almost to the day, again on September 11, when Islamic jihadists targeted the American consulate. They not only burned it down, but they also took the life—for the first time in 30 years, we lost an American Ambassador, Chris Stevens. What is so shameful is that 2 years later Libya is in absolute chaos today. Just in the last month, we saw Islamic jihadists take over the airfield in Tripoli.

I was in Tripoli earlier this year. I had visited the American Embassy earlier this year. I went outside and observed a moment of silence in front of the memorial recognizing our Ambassador, Chris Stevens. It is right outside, between the Embassy and the swimming pool at the Embassy. And shamefully, about a week, 2 weeks ago, we saw Islamic jihadists had so pressurized our Embassy that the people in our Embassy wisely abandoned the Embassy and took off for Tunisia and escaped out of Libya with their lives, thank God.

The Islamic jihadists, the terrorists, came into the United States Embassy and took over and had a party in our Embassy and made a video that they posted on YouTube that had them standing on the second-floor balcony at the Embassy, jumping joyfully into the swimming pool, splashing in the swimming pool, mere yards from the memorial to our killed Ambassador, Chris Stevens.

You see, we are not winning the war against Islamic jihad. Our President infamously told us in the runup to his reelection in 2012 that al Qaeda was defeated. Core al Qaeda was nearly gone; it was defeated. Al Qaeda was on the run, our President assured us. I only wish our President would have been right.

Sitting on the Intelligence Committee, I knew without a shadow of a doubt what our President was saying in 2012 was absolutely wrong. It wasn't true. I knew al Qaeda wasn't defeated. I knew that al Qaeda across the world was continuing to gain traction. We knew that. And yet we were told that, with the death of bin Laden, all had been solved. Thank you very much. Tragically, nothing could be further from the truth.

Tragically, James Foley, the United States photojournalist who was beheaded by ISIS, knew that that wasn't true, as well as Steven Sotloff, the other United States journalist who also was beheaded by the Islamic State.

You see, actions have consequences; ideas have consequences. And when the decision was made by President Obama of releasing Baghdadi from the United States detention center for whatever reason, that has had profound consequences. Ask the thousands of Iraqis who are now dead. Ask the thousands

of Yazidis who are dead and displaced. Ask the hundreds and maybe thousands of women who have been raped and violated, and young girls, those in Syria who have had to deal with the same. The tragic consequences are being felt even here in the United States.

Then we watched, with startling speed, the bank robberies that occurred when Baghdadi had to find a source of income and revenue to run the Islamic State. He did that by robbing banks. There are various reports. Some reports say that he stole over \$400 million, some say over \$100 million, others say various amounts. The fact is now we had an Islamic jihadist who could support himself through bank robberies. But he didn't stop there. He knew that that wouldn't be enough to accomplish the dreams that he had to establish a global Islamic State.

And so, besides robbing banks, besides reconstituting an army, he decided that he would also take over oil fields in the Kurdistan area of northern Iraq. He took over the oilfield. Some reports say that he sells on the black market oil that comes in at potentially \$1 million a day; other open-source documents say other amounts. But the fact is we have the Islamic State supporting itself by selling oil on the black market, and that oil goes to fund terrorism.

He also didn't stop there. Baghdadi also was strategic and he took over an oil refinery, the oil refinery which supplies the energy to the Islamic State to run their vehicles, their airplanes, whatever it is that they need energy for.

They also took over an electric grid so that they could have electricity. They didn't take over every village; they didn't need to. They could cause them to fall through intimidation, just as they did in Mosul, and that is what was stunning.

Imagine you have got an army estimated to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000 to 12,000, and you can take over a city of 1.7 million, just one. You see, that is what terrorism does. It so intimidates people that live in the community that they decide, We can't win; we aren't even going to try.

That is why the United States can't stay silent. That is why we must stand and act and recognize. We are at war. We are at war because the Islamic State has declared war against the United States, Western Europe. They declared war on anyone who isn't them. But they have been very clear about declaring war against the United States.

The Islamic State also made another strategic capture. They captured air bases, Iraqi air bases. And when they did that, they captured United States equipment. So the Islamic jihad is fighting with the latest United States equipment.

They reportedly have United States helicopters, United States planes. They reportedly have United States weaponry and United States ammunition.

They also have uniforms that they captured from the Iraqi forces. They captured Humvees, armaments, the oil fields. They also captured natural gas fields in central Syria.

Well, this spring as I was watching this occur, I am from the State of Minnesota, and unfortunately Minnesota has a very long connection to terrorism. I went to the FBI earlier this summer, and I asked the FBI for a private classified meeting. I asked the FBI if there were any Minnesotans that had joined the Islamic State and had traveled to the Middle East to fight on their behalf. They told me at that time the information was classified. It no longer is. The FBI told me that there were two Minnesotans who had traveled and joined the Islamic State.

So I had asked the obvious question, which was: If they are not killed in that battle, and if they choose to come back to the United States—we know who they are; we know what they have done—will they be allowed to come back into the United States? And I was told, Yes, they will. They are American citizens. They have passports. We can't stop them from coming into the United States.

I was floored. Here we are trying to track down and murder terrorists in Afghanistan. We have American citizens who have left the United States and who have joined with the Islamic State—and, by the way, the creed of the Islamic State says, when you join the Islamic State, you have renounced every other form of government and you are now submitting to the government of the Islamic State. How is it that that individual then would be able to come in?

The FBI said, Well, we put those individuals on a watch list and we give them further screening at the airport. I asked, What you do mean, further screening? They said, Well, we ask them questions.

And then they are allowed to get on a plane and then they are allowed to come into the United States and travel freely?

Yes, they are.

That floored me. I thought that couldn't possibly be. And then we saw the events transpire this summer. And tragically, we saw the very first American who was killed fighting for the Islamists, the Islamic State, was a Minnesotan. His name was Doug McCain, from Minnesota, from the Twin Cities suburban area. He was an African American youth from Chicago. He had come with his family to Minnesota, where had he been converted to Islam and radicalized in the Twin Cities and became a fighter for the Islamic State. He was the first American.

Very shortly thereafter, a second American was reported to have been killed fighting for the Islamic State—in the same battle. That was also a Minnesotan, another young man, who was a Somali American. Minnesota has the largest Somali population in the

world outside of Somalia. And that Somali man traveled over as well.

And so had these two individuals, had they been in the war with the Islamic State and, rather than getting killed decided to come back, they would not have been impeded by the United States Government from coming back.

Now, think of this. Here you have individuals who have given their allegiance to the Islamic State—oh, and by the way, one of their friends from high school was killed in 2009. He also was fighting in the Middle East in Islamic jihad. His name was Troy Kastigar. And Troy Kastigar was featured in a video, a recruitment video, inviting more Americans to come and join Islamic jihad.

Troy Kastigar said that he was glad—I am paraphrasing—he was glad to be a traitor to America. And yet, under our current law, Troy Kastigar can be a killer and fight against the interests of the United States and travel to the Middle East, be a terrorist, and then freely come back to the United States with battlefield experience, maybe a plan for terrorism in the United States, and he can roam freely in this country?

There is something seriously wrong here, Mr. Speaker, something very seriously wrong. Have we completely lost our minds that we wouldn't even prevent a terrorist, a known, avowed terrorist from returning to the United States where he could carry out terrorist activity here in the United States?

You see, we think that things have been fairly peaceful, but at a minimum, there have been 53 different terrorist plots that our government has stopped. We have foiled 53 plots, at minimum, since 2001, since the terrorist activity.

We didn't foil all of them. We didn't foil the Islamic jihadists in Arkansas who killed a United States soldier. And this individual also had been converted to Islam and killed the soldier who was at a recruiting station, I believe an Army recruiting station. We didn't stop the two refugees who were in Boston, the Tsarnaev brothers, at the Boston Marathon bombing.

Despite the fact that our FBI was given a cable from the Russian FSB—that is their intelligence service. They gave a cable to our FBI that it appeared that the Tsarnaev brothers had—there was a question of terrorist involvement and terrorist activity. The Tsarnaev brothers weren't stopped, and people, tragically, were hurt during the Boston Marathon bombing.

So we have seen those attempts, as we also saw another attempt of the infamous Christmas Day underwear bomber, who had left London, headed to Minneapolis, Minnesota, with the express intention of blowing himself up as a suicide bomber with a concoction that someone had put together for him, and he attempted to blow up the plane. At that time, it was Northwest Airlines, the precursor to today's Delta Air Lines. He tried to blow himself up

over the city of Detroit, but thank God he was unsuccessful. Again, it was yet one more plot here in the United States.

And there were more. There were attempts on one of our former President's life, George W. Bush, at his home. There have been other plots as well. Thank God we have foiled so many of them. But what that should speak to us, Mr. Speaker, is that the problem isn't just in the Middle East.

□ 1915

The problem is here in the United States, and that is why we have to act now. We have to act forward thinking so we don't allow them to reach their goals. Well, I went to the FBI, and I asked them this question. Again, I was shocked at the answer.

Earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the United States Congress. It is gaining a fair amount of traction with both Democrats and Republicans. It essentially says this: If you are an American citizen, and if you have gone to join ISIS, a foreign terrorist organization, and you want to return to the United States, your passport will be taken from you, and you will begin the process of denaturalization. In other words, we will do everything within our power to prevent you from coming back into this United States. You can try to come in—and, unfortunately, too many try to come in through our southern border—but we are going to try and make sure that you are not successful. My bill is called the Terrorist Denaturalization and Passport Revocation Act to amend section 349(a) of the United States Code.

Well, not only that, from Minnesota, the FBI estimates we have at least 20 Somali Americans from Minnesota that have left our State and have traveled to the Middle East to join the Islamic jihad. Just last week, a 19-year-old Somali American woman left St. Paul to join the Islamic jihad. What I am told is that all three of the women that have gone to join from the United States are from the State of Minnesota. They are continuing to recruit.

Our southern border remains, for all practical purposes, wide open so foreign nationals can cross into the United States. Again, it is not the fault of the Border Patrol. I actually naively thought on my visit about 6 weeks ago to our southern border that the Border Patrol actually stops foreign nationals from coming in. I thought they did. I was shocked to find out that the Border Patrol doesn't stop anyone. Nearly 100 percent of foreign nationals who want to come into the United States through our southern border come in. They come in. The Border Patrol is a people processing pipeline. So they come in. They may not all get to stay, but they certainly all do come in. Again, that is not the fault of the Border Patrol. That is the fault of politicians who haven't made the decision to actually secure America's southern

border and to set up the police, to set up the law enforcement to make that happen, and also to instantaneously deport foreign nationals back across the border. I was told, as a matter of fact, if I didn't mention it before, that foreign nationals from over 140 countries have already made their way into the United States just so far this year.

We have a lot on our plate right now, Mr. Speaker, a lot that we have to pay attention to. The United States could have stopped them in the cradle, and they weren't. They could have been stopped before they were reconstituted. The President could have retained Baghdadi in the United States detention system. We wouldn't have had the beheadings that we saw of James Foley or of Steve Sotloff, and hundreds of thousands of innocent people wouldn't be dead today had the President made that decision, but he didn't.

It is also important for us to realize Iraq pled with the United States to do drone strikes against the Islamic State dating back to August of 2013. Wouldn't it have been important to listen to Iraq? They were the ones dealing with the Islamic State in 2013. They begged us to do drone strikes and take out the leadership in Iraq. What was the answer of President Obama? No. He took a pass. He didn't listen to the calls of Iraq, and we didn't take out the leadership when we had the chance.

The Iraq foreign minister came to the United States, and he begged for the United States to help against the Islamic State. He also went home empty-handed. There were multiple knocks on the President's door to do something about the Islamic State even back in 2013 by our partners who we were trying to help be successful in Iraq. Unfortunately, our President did not answer that call.

On May 11, the President of Iraq, al-Maliki, asked CENTCOM to strike the Islamic State with drones. That was on May 11, this spring. I was on the Intelligence Committee. I was seeing the up tempo, and all of us were seeing the up tempo of the Islamic State and the rise of the Islamic jihad. Again, the president of Iraq asked our CENTCOM to do drone strikes and take out the Islamic State. Al Maliki said, "I will approve the airstrikes. I will get behind you." He was told "no."

The problem, you see, wasn't al-Maliki in the spring. The problem is that the President and his team decided not to help when we had ample opportunities. A meeting was held very early on on how to defeat al Qaeda both in Pakistan and Afghanistan. It was written about by a weekly news magazine author who had the ability to be in that meeting. And in that early meeting of the Obama administration, a meeting both with Pakistan and Afghanistan on how to defeat al Qaeda, they didn't discuss in that meeting—and it was very telling—they didn't discuss a strategy to actually defeat al Qaeda. What they did is take along our agriculture secretary, Tom Vilsack,

and the conversation rather than being about actually defeating al Qaeda was about planting seeds in Pakistan and planting seeds for the agriculture community and growing the agriculture community in both countries. Now, I am not saying that that is not a worthwhile meeting, but if your point in having the meeting is to defeat al Qaeda, that is the subject that you should be covering, and you should come up with a plan. That was, again, at this point, over 4 years ago, and we are here tomorrow night about to hear from the President. Does he finally have a plan? Once the crisis got to the point of American citizens being beheaded on TV before our eyes in the most cruel, barbaric way possible, now we are only starting to reengage.

The Islamic State crisis, unfortunately, is one that will be very difficult because we have seen United States forces prematurely moved out of that region. So were we forewarned? We absolutely were forewarned. And it isn't just the administration. We also knew during George W. Bush's tenure as President of the United States that the foreign policy establishment, the military establishment, also knew. There is a clip that has gone on YouTube recently of President George W. Bush in 2007, and I will read exactly verbatim what the President said July 12, 2007. George W. Bush warned the Nation then:

It would mean surrendering the future of Iraq to al Qaeda if the United States completely removed ourselves from Iraq. It would mean that we would be risking mass killings on a horrific scale.

It would mean that we would allow the terrorists to establish a safe haven in Iraq to replace the one they lost in Afghanistan.

It would mean increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous.

It is beyond belief the statement that was made by George W. Bush back in July 12 of 2007. It is as though the President has most accurately described exactly what President Obama will address tomorrow night by his ill-made decision in 2011 not to leave American residual forces to maintain the peace.

I want to give credit tonight, Mr. Speaker, to the American heroes, the American soldiers who won the peace and defeated the enemy in Iraq—yes, they did—and in Afghanistan. In order to maintain the peace, we needed to maintain a strong American presence, just like today we have in South Korea. I was in South Korea in August. We maintain an American presence. Why? Because there is an aggressor in North Korea. We have our force on location so that we can let the aggressor know, if you try something, we are here, and you won't succeed. And that has worked very well in South Korea. That has worked very well in Western Europe.

Unfortunately, President Obama didn't learn the lessons of history, and he made the ill-timed decision to pull

American residual forces out of Iraq. That decision has led to the consequences that we have today, and it is why, again, I would plead with the President of the United States to not pull American forces out of Afghanistan, either. Because I heard over and over and over when I was in Kabul, Afghanistan, over the Memorial Day weekend, May 30, that if the United States leaves Afghanistan, everyone on the ground knows the Taliban will be back. It will be bloody, and it won't be pretty, and it will be back to square one after \$1 trillion worth of treasure. But, more importantly, after the sacrifice of thousands of brave American lives. That is not how we should honor their memory nor their sacrifice. And the same with the brave American men and women in our Armed Forces, and contractors, et cetera, who lost their life also to win the peace in Iraq. Again, President George Bush had it right in July of 2007. We needed those residual forces.

Yes, this is a continuation of Islamic jihad. Yes, this is, at its basis, a religious war—not America saying it. That is the terrorists themselves telling us that they are at war with us because they intend to force conversions to their religion of Islam.

Well, what is very unusual about the Islamic State is this: they have a land, and they have a territory. We have a philosophy, we have been fighting, now we have a land and a territory, a new caliphate. It is at least half of Syria and at least half of Iraq. It has a head, Baghdadi, who has declared himself the caliph of this new caliphate. He has a committed army of 12,000 terrorist soldiers, many of whom he released from terrorist prisons. They have a form of government, Islamic sharia law, and they follow that to the tee.

They have money from banks that they have robbed, from oilfields, and from the revenue that they take from gasfields. They also have a self-sustaining infrastructure with their energy production. They are seeking to obtain weapons of mass destruction. They obtained 90 pounds of low-enriched uranium. There is now a fear that materials that could be used to form a nuclear bomb are items on the wish list and the shopping list of the Islamic State. We need to do everything that we can to prevent them from achieving their goal of putting together the elements for a nuclear weapon.

We also need to be aware that Pakistan is also in a vulnerable position. There are reports that Pakistan may have upwards of 200 nuclear weapons. Pakistan is a Sunni state. The Islamic State led by Baghdadi is also a Sunni Islamic jihadist enterprise. If they choose to make a deal with Pakistan for nuclear material or a nuclear weapon, that would change the dynamic overnight. And that is why it is imperative that another Islamic state, Iran, a Shia Islamic state, never, ever, ever obtain a nuclear weapon. Because if

Iran obtains a nuclear weapon, they have stated unequivocally they will use that nuclear weapon to wipe Israel off the map. They will also use that weapon, they have stated, against the United States to defeat the United States of America.

You see, nuclear weapons matter, Mr. Speaker, and they must never, ever go into the hands in any way of committed Islamic jihadist terrorists. Iran is a terror State. It is a United States-designated terror state. There are only four in the world. Iran is one of them.

Now we have the Islamic State. The Islamic State headed by Baghdadi also seeks destruction, and they mean it. We have seen it, and we have to take it seriously. That is why we must engage them and not allow them to succeed because the Islamic State now has weapons from the United States equal to weapons that we have in our Army. They have weapons from the Russian Government, and they also have Iranian weapons, as well—sophisticated weapons and individuals with the knowledge and ability to be able to use those weapons.

They also control borders that weren't in the control of jihadists before. Just recently, they gained control of a border at the Golan Heights on Israel's border. This is approximately 200 yards from Israel in a demilitarization area. Nonetheless, they took United Nations workers hostage just as the Islamic State took 49 Turks hostage out of the Turkish Embassy in northern Iraq.

□ 1930

They have taken checkpoints on the Jordan border with Iraq. The Islamic State has taken over. They have virtually erased the border with Syria. They have taken over checkpoints in Lebanon, also in Turkey and also in the Kurdistan region, so they control territory in a way that they never have before.

They have some of the most sophisticated recruitment materials in the world today through Facebook, through Twitter. They know exactly what the message is and who they need to target to join them in the Islamic jihad.

Unfortunately, in my home State of Minnesota, we know all too well how successful the Islamic State has been in drawing in literally thousands from Western Europe to join them in jihad, but also Americans as well. They are the cool kid on the block, if you will. That is where young people want to go, and that is who they are attracted to.

As I said earlier, the leader of the Islamic State is a man named Baghdadi, a man who was released from American detention by President Obama in 2009, who went on to reconstitute this horrific Islamic jihad called the Islamic State. He is in his early forties. He is in the prime of life. He believes this is his moment. He has declared himself the head, the caliph, of the new state, the caliphate.

He was involved in al Qaeda leadership for decades. He was literally number three in al Qaeda of Iraq, the first franchise. He was an associate of Bin Laden. He has a doctorate degree. He was born in Samarra, Iraq. He understands Iraq. He understands that it is his destiny, from his opinion, to fulfill the reestablishment of the caliphate, and he has no interest in waiting. He is on the march.

He made a statement in January of this year that I read previously, but it is one that bears repeating, and he said this to the United States. He said, "Soon we will be in direct confrontation with you, United States, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching."

That is why we need to understand that we very likely have Islamic jihad terrorists here in the United States today. We know that there are those who went to join ISIS who have returned to the United States. They are terrorists.

We need to call them for who they are. They aren't engaged in workplace violence, as our former head of Homeland Security erroneously said. They are terrorists. They are murderers. They live to kill innocent human beings.

They do it because they believe that they are pleasing their God when they do. According to their belief, not mine, not what I am saying, what they say, they believe that if they are a martyr, if they die in the way of jihad, that is their only one sure way to go to heaven. That is what they say in their belief.

We need to understand who the enemy is. We need to understand the enemy's motivation, not what we wish the enemy thinks, not what we hope the enemy thinks. We need to understand what the enemy—the terrorists—actually say about themselves and say about their beliefs and say about what their goals are because, you see, Sun Tzu wrote in his book "The Art of War," there are two rules to win in a conflict.

One is you need to know yourself, you need to know who you are, you need to know what your attributes are, what your strengths, what your weaknesses are as an army, as a nation, as an individual, but you also need to know who your enemy is.

That is why it was so concerning when the FBI decided—not only the FBI, but other agencies of our government, the CIA included, but in particular, I am familiar with the FBI—when the FBI agreed that they would purge the training manuals of FBI agents, and they purged the manuals of materials on Islam, and the materials that they purged were quotes from the Koran—why did they do that? Why in the world would our FBI not want its agents to understand the motivation of terrorists?

This isn't about being mean to Muslims, this isn't about being mean to anybody's religion or being insensitive

to anyone's religion—because in the United States you have freedom of religion, you can believe what you want to believe, but you can't take, as your basis and your justification, religious belief to go and kill other people or hurt other people—that, you can't do.

It is important again that our FBI, our law enforcement mechanism, understands the motivation of who the enemies are and why they are doing what they are doing. That is why it is so dangerous for the FBI not to train our agents in what the motivation is of Islamic jihad.

Well, you see, we witnessed the Islamic jihad, we witnessed them also taking hostages. I mentioned 49 Turkish hostages have been taken. They have taken hostages of the British, the French, Germans, United States hostages, including the two journalists that we had mentioned that they tragically took.

This is age-old. This has been a part of what has happened in Islamic jihad through the millennia with ransoms and piracy and taking hostages for money.

The demand was made of the United States that we would pay \$132 million for the release of James Foley. It is curious that that demand was made almost immediately after President Obama illegally and unfortunately negotiated with terrorists to release the alleged deserter Bergdahl in exchange for five Taliban.

The five top leaders of the Taliban, the five top strategists, the five top leaders of the Taliban, the enemy that we are fighting in Afghanistan, the President of the United States negotiated with terrorists so that we would release from detention in Guantanamo Bay the five top strategists of the terrorists that we are fighting in Afghanistan. He released those five top terrorists in exchange for the alleged deserter Bergdahl.

Now, that was a first. The United States hadn't done that before. We have had a policy of we don't negotiate for hostages, and that has served us very well because the world understood—the thugs and the animals and the savages and barbarians of the world understood you are not going to get anywhere with the United States, they are not going to pay for hostages, they are not going to give up prisoners in exchange. It is not going to happen.

It is a way of life with other countries, not with the United States of America, not until May of 2014 when President Obama, in my opinion, tragically made the decision that he would negotiate with terrorists in order to regain the alleged deserter Bowe Bergdahl.

Almost immediately, we saw the demand by the terrorists for money for James Foley. We did not comply, and he was beheaded. Then the demand came for the United States to release Lady al Qaeda in exchange for Steve Sotloff, and we didn't comply. That is why we are looking forward to what



the President of the United States has to say tomorrow. We have to defeat this enemy, the Islamic State.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REDUCING THE RISK OF FIRES IN OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I think we just heard a 1-hour audition for FOX News, but we did not hear a solution to what is a very real problem. We didn't hear a call for a vote, which we are going to have to take if we are to carry out our constitutional obligations, and that is going to be before us.

I don't want to carry on the discussion about the very serious problem of ISIL or ISIS. We have heard a lot of that already. We will have to come to grips with that by October 6 or 7, when the 60-day clock on the War Powers Act runs out and our constitutional obligation takes place.

There are many, many problems facing this Nation, and certainly, the international scene is one of them, but there is also a problem in our communities. I represent a large portion of California, the national forests on the Sierra side and the national forests on the coastal side of the Sacramento Valley. A lot of that is in the U.S. Forest Service, as well as in the Bureau of Land Management.

Over the last several years, those two agencies have been struggling to put out the fires that have raged in the Western United States and, indeed, in the Southeast of the United States. The way in which we have set up the budgeting and the appropriation for fighting fires has created an ongoing cycle of increasing the likelihood of new fires.

We need to change that. We need to get ahead of the century of fire repression and put in place policies and programs that will reduce the risks of fires. We need to manage our forests in such a way that the fire risk is reduced, the forests are thinned, trees appropriately harvested, the undergrowth reduced and eliminated, firebreaks put in place, and protect our communities by the proper management of the forest, reducing the fuel, reducing the load of fuel that these forests have.

We have been unable to do that, principally because we have seen an enormous increase in the number of fires, and the Federal budget to fight these fires is a 10-year rolling average that has not been able to keep up with the increase each year in the megafires, California most recently facing the rim fire in the Yosemite area.

That fire gobbled up not only the forest, but gobbled up the money that was set aside to prevent fires to manage the forest. Instead of having that fund

available to do that kind of work, the money was transferred from those programs into the firefighting.

Now, this is an ongoing problem. My colleague from California, SCOTT PETERS, has addressed this problem with a motion to bring to the floor legislation that would set up a new mechanism for appropriating funds for fighting fires. I will let him discuss that and why he has this before us.

Mr. PETERS, if you would join us.

Mr. PETERS of California. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for helping to raise awareness about the pressing need to change the way the Federal Government deals with funding wildfire response and prevention.

As you well know, the devastating effect of wildfires in 2003 and 2007—we had massive, massive loss of property and dislocations in Scripps Ranch, Tierrasanta, Rancho Bernardo, and Poway.

Right now, as I am speaking—and you mentioned this as well—firefighters in Yosemite National Park continue to battle a wildfire that has burned more than 2,600 acres and required 120 firefighters and 11 aircraft to combat.

It is no secret, in addition, that California is facing a prolonged drought that places us at increased risk for wildfires. So we are in the midst of what is expected to be one of the longest and hardest wildfire seasons in recent memory, certainly in any of our memories.

Wildfires are extremely expensive for States and localities to fight. There is an urgent need for Congress to pass a solution that funds firefighting without stealing from prevention, which is a crazy thing to do. I think we all acknowledge that.

Earlier this summer, as you mentioned, I led the discharge petition with 196 signers to demand a vote on the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014. That bill has real bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate—71 Democrats and 60 Republicans have cosponsored in the House—and that is very unusual around here. It was also included by the President in his budget request.

So you have both parties in the House and the President of the United States all on the same page on this issue. It seems like an area where we ought be able to make some progress, and we ought to have a vote.

The bill allows firefighting agencies to access funds from the natural disaster contingency fund while fighting catastrophic fires, not take money from prevention because, of course, what that does is it makes the following year's fires even more severe and even more costly and dangerous.

□ 1945

So it is fiscally responsible to treat wildfires like the natural disasters that they are, like an earthquake, flood, or hurricane. Instead of stealing funds from prevention efforts to pay for im-

mediate responses, we should be adequately funding both.

I join my colleagues here tonight to call on the Speaker to bring this truly bipartisan bill to a vote immediately so that fire-prone regions like the two we are dealing with in California—mine in San Diego—don't suffer from Washington's dysfunction.

Ladies and gentlemen, we started this fire season this year in May. We are used to having fire seasons. It is natural to have fire seasons in September or October, but the fact that we started in May just underscores what we are up against. We do not want to leave for our October election activities without having dealt with that and exposing these communities to risk.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI, for helping to raise awareness about this. Thank you for your continued commitment and leadership on the issue. We look forward to bringing it home.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. PETERS, for your leadership in bringing to the attention of the entire Nation, and certainly to the 435 Members of this House, that there is a way to manage our forests and to deal with the fires that have plagued us so extensively over these many years.

I think all of us have seen this before. It is Smokey the Bear. "Only you can prevent forest fires." We need to add to it, "But Congress can help." And Smokey turns to us and says: How can you help? Well, we can help by changing the way in which we budget for the fighting of fires. Instead of a rolling 10-year average and putting that money up every year and in 9 of the last 12 years blowing through that budget and then reaching back and taking the forest management funds that would allow us to reduce the risk of fires in our forests and in your public lands, instead of doing that, we would have a different system, as Mr. PETERS just described. It is H.R. 3992.

H.R. 3992 is a bipartisan bill, Democrats and Republicans. Democrat Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon and Republican Mr. SIMPSON from Idaho, the authors of the bill, say there is a better way of doing it. Set aside a special reserve, just like we do for tornadoes, earthquakes, hurricanes, floods; a special reserve that could be tapped when we exceed the average and blow through that 10-year average with a megafire or a series of fires.

We expect more than 38,000 fires this year in the United States. We are going to blow through that budget. Just this last month in August, the chief forester of the U.S. Forest Service sent a letter out to every part of the U.S. Forest Service saying: Hold on. No more contracts. Save the money. We are going to need to transfer some of your maintenance money. Your fire prevention money, the money that you are using to thin the forests to reduce the fuel load, the money that you are using to carry out logging practices, hold that. We are going to need to hold that